

New Light on Šimaški and Its Rulers*

by Piotr Steinkeller – Harvard University

An examination of the data pertaining to the Šimaškian Yabrat (Ebarat) reveals that this Iranian ruler controlled, during the later phase of the Ur III period, a powerful state in central Iran. It appears that Yabrat's influence extended to the neighboring state of Anšan, which may even have been his political dependency. A close and dependent ally of the House of Ur until the reign of Ibši-Suen, Yabrat subsequently became a major threat to Babylonia. The article seeks to reconstruct the history of the interactions between Yabrat and the Ur III state, and to provide an improved understanding of Šimaški as a political and geographic phenomenon. The question of the historicity of the so-called "Šimaškian King List" is also considered.

The understanding of the role of Šimaški in the history of the Ur III period was considerably advanced by the realization that the logogram LÚ.SU(A)^{ki}, which serves as a topographic and ethnic designation in Ur III and early Old Babylonian sources, is a writing of Šimaški's name. Presented as a hypothesis by this author,¹ this reading was subsequently confirmed by M. Civil, based on the replacement of LÚ.SU^{ki} by a syllabic writing Ši-ma-aš-ki in an Emar manuscript of the literary letter "Siniddinam to Utu."²

* I take this opportunity to offer my cordial thanks to P. Michalowski, W. Sallaberger, and Christopher Woods, who read the preliminary version of this article. All three of them offered various suggestions and corrections, and supplied additional textual references. While the final product unquestionably profited from their input, they are in no way responsible for the views expressed here. That burden rests with me alone. Abbreviations used are those of the Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago and/or the Sumerian Dictionary of the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, with the following additions:

Hilgert Drehem 1 M. Hilgert, *Drehem Administrative Documents from the Reign of Šulgi*. Oriental Institute Publications 115 (Chicago 1998)

Hilgert Drehem 2 M. Hilgert, *Drehem Administrative Documents from the Reign of Amar-Suena*. Oriental Institute Publications 121 (Chicago 2003)

König EKI F. W. König, *Die elamischen Königsinschriften*. Archiv für Orientalforschung Beiheft 16 (1965)

¹ On the Identity of the Toponym LÚ.SU(A), JAOS 108 (1988) 197–202; More on LÚ.SU(A) = Šimaški, NABU 1990/7.

² Sin-iddinam in Emar and SU.A = Šimaški, NABU 1996/41.

While already proven beyond any reasonable doubt,³ the reading Ši-maški of LÚ.SU.(A)^{ki} is additionally demonstrated by a recently published Ur III tablet, which identifies Kirname as a LÚ.SU.A^{ki}.⁴ This agrees with the testimony of the Šimaškian king list (henceforth referred to as ŠKL),⁵ according to which Kirname was a ruler of Šimaški. For Kirname, see in detail below.

The most extensive sources of information on the geographical location of Šimaški are the historical inscriptions of Šu-Suen, which describe his campaign against Zabšali and other Šimaškian lands,⁶ during the seventh or sixth year of his reign.⁷ These sources mention some sixteen Šimaškian principalities, specifically identifying Zabšali, Šigriš, Yabulmat, Alu-midatum, Karta, and Šatilu as the most prominent ones.⁸ Among these,

³ Remarkably, in spite of all this evidence, as late as 2002 M.-J. Steve/F. Vallat/H. Gasche, art. Suse, Supplément au dictionnaire de la bible, Fascicule 73 (Paris 2002) 432–40, obstinately stood by Vallat's idea that LÚ.SU.(A)^{ki} means "a man of Susa" or the region of Susiana. Needless to say, this position has no scholarly merit whatsoever.

⁴ Ba-x¹-[...] ... Ba-a[b-du-ša] lú-kin-gi₄-a lā-[ab]-ra-at LÚ.SU.A^{ki}-me ... Šu-tu-un-gu lú-kin-gi₄-a Ki-ir-na-mi LÚ.SU.A^{ki} (Sigrist Ontario 149:1–5). That Kirname was a LÚ.SU.(A)^{ki} was anticipated by this author in JAOS 108, 200.

⁵ RA 28 (1931) 2. This source, which stems from Susa and dates to Old Babylonian times, has most recently been edited by I. J. Gelb/B. Kienast, Die altakkadischen Königsinschriften des dritten Jahrtausends v. Chr. FAOS 7 (Stuttgart 1990) 317–18. A photograph of the obverse of this tablet was published by T. Potts, Mesopotamia and the East: An Archaeological and Historical Study of Foreign Relations 3400–2000 BC (Oxford 1994) 31 fig. 4. The names and sequence of the Šimaškian rulers listed in it (lines 16–26) are as follows:

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| 1) ^d Gi-ir-na-am-me | 7) I-da-at-tū |
| 2) Tā-zi-it-ta | 8) Tān-ru-hu-at-te-er |
| 3) E-ba-ar-ti | 9) E-[ba]-ar-ti |
| 4) Tā-zi-it-ta | 10) I-da-at-tu |
| 5) Lu-x-x-ak? ¹ -lu-uh-ha-an | 11) I-da-at-tu-na-pi-ir |
| 6) Ki-in-da-at-t[u] | 12) I-da-at-tu-te-em-ti |

12 LUGAL.MEŠ Ši-maš-ki!-ú

⁶ Frayne, RIME 3/2, 301–06 Šu-Sin 3, 308–12 Šu-Sin 5.

⁷ mu ^dŠu-^dSuen ... ma-da Za-ab-ša-li^{ki} mu-hul, "year Šu-Suen ... destroyed the land of Zabšali" (year Šu-Suen 7).

⁸ ^rma¹-ta-at Si-maš-ki-im^{ki} [ū]-ḫa-li-iq ma-at Za-ab-ša-li^{ki} ma-at Si-ig<-ri>-i^{ki} ma-at lā-bu-ul-ma-at^{ki} ma-at A-lu-mi-da-tim^{ki} ma-at Ga-ar-ta^{ki} ma-at Ša-ti-lu^{ki} ŠU.NÍGIN 6 ma-^rda-tim¹/MA.D[A] A-za-ha-ar^{ki} Bu-ul-ma^{ki} Nu-šu-uš-ma-ar^{ki} [N]u-uš-g[a-n]e-[l]u-um^{ki} [Z]i-zi-ir-[l]um^{ki} [A]-^rra-hi¹-[ir^{ki}] [...] "(Šu-Suen) destroyed the lands of Šimaški, (namely) Zabšali, Šigriš, Yabulmat, Alumidatim, Garta (and) Šatilu, a total of six lands; (plus the lands of) ..." (Frayne RIME 3/2, 308–12 Šu-Sin 5 Ex. 2 9–20 + Ex. 1 14–28); u-d-ba Ši-maški(LÚ.SU)^{ki} ma-da ma-da Za-ab-ša-li^{ki} zag An-ša-an^{ki}-ta a-ab-ba igi-nim-ma-šè buru₅-gim zi-ga-bi lā-bu-ul-ma-at^{ki} ^rx¹-[x-x-a]m^{ki} Si-ig-ri-iš^{ki} A-lu-mi-da-tim^{ki} Ga-ar-da^{ki} A-za-ha-ar^{ki} Bu-ul-ma^{ki} Nu-šu-uš-ma-ar^{ki} Zi-zi-ir-tum^{ki} A-ra-hi-

Zabšali clearly was the most important (and therefore probably also the largest) principality, since the “lands of Zabšali” is a shorthand writing for the entire Šimaškan federation.⁹

To the east, the Šimaškan territories extended as far as Anšan, while to the north, they bordered on the shores of the Caspian Sea.¹⁰ In the west, they appear to have reached deep into the Zagros ranges. This is indicated by the data bearing on the conflict with Šimaški in the year Šulgi 46 (see below), as well as by the possible inclusion of Lullubum, a well-known Zagros locality, among the Šimaškan opponents of Šu-Suen.¹¹

Prior to the Šimaškan war in the second half of Šu-Suen’s reign, the only documented instance of a conflict between the Ur III state and the Šimaškan lands occurred in the year Šulgi 46, when we find records of livestock and animal products that were brought to Puzriš-Dagan as “booty of Šimaški.”¹² This conflict, which also involved operations

ir^{ki} *Ša-ti-lu*^{ki} *Ti-ir-mi-um*^{ki} *ʿu*¹ [...], “at that time Šimaški (which comprises) the lands of Zabšali, rose like locusts from the borders of Anšan up to the ‘Upper Sea’ (i.e., Caspian Sea), (namely the lands of) ...” (Frayne RIME 3/2, 301–306 Šu-Sin 3 ii 14–35).

The combined list of all the lesser Šimaškan lands named in these inscriptions is as follows: Arahir, Azahar, Bulma, Lullubum?, Nušganelum, Nušušmar, Tarmi’um, Zizirtum, [x]-ʿ¹-li-[x]^{ki}, and ʿx¹-[x-x-a]m^{ki}.

⁹ See the preceding note and the following two examples: *ud-ba Šimaški* (LÚ.SU)^{ki} *ma-da ma-da Za-ab-ša-li*^{ki} *zag! An-ša-an*^{ki}-ta [...], “at that time Šimaški (which comprises) the lands of Zabšali, from the border of Anšan [...]” (Frayne, RIME 3/2, pp. 307–08 Šu-Sin 4 ii 21’–23’); *ud ma-da Za-a[b]-ša-li*^{ki} *ù ma-d[a m]a-da Šimaški* (LÚ.SU)^{ki}-ka *mu-hul-a*, “when he destroyed the land of Zabšali and the (other) lands of Šimaški” (Frayne RIME 3/2, 313 Šu-Sin 6 lines 5’–8’).

¹⁰ See the preceding two notes.

¹¹ See Frayne, RIME 3/2, 312 Ex. 1 Caption 8:1–3: *Wa-bu-ur-tum* [ÉN]SI [Lu?]-lu-bi-im^{ki}.

¹² For the sources in question, see Steinkeller, JAOS 108, 201 n. 31, to which add PDT 802 iv 37, vi 3, 36, vii 38 (Šulgi 47/v); Hilgert Drehem 1 355:4 (Šulgi 48/x). Note that the former source also names *nam-ra-ak kur MAR.TU* (iv 8, 41), further confirming that the operations against Šimaški and the Amorites were related. The Šimaškan behind this conflict apparently was a certain Badadu. Note: 16 cow and 25 sheep hides *kuš siki mú kuš gud udu nam-ra-ak Ba-da-du* LÚ.SU *ki Šu-En-líl-lá dumu lugal-ta Ûlu-lál šu ba-ti*, “hides with hair, the hides from the booty of Badadu, the Šimaškan; Ululal received (them) from Šu-Enlila, king’s son” (Sigrist Princeton 130:1–11 – Šulgi 46/v). Among other sources bearing on the same campaign note especially the following two: a two-day banquet at the temples of Enlil and Ninlil *ud énsi Ki-maš*^{ki} *in-ma-dab*₃-ʿba¹-a, “when the ensi of Kimaš was captured” (Hilgert Drehem 1 428:15–Š 46/v/3); 221 cattle and 10,736 sheep delivered by Bubu and (the prince) Šu-Enlila *nam-ra-ak Ki-maš*^{ki} ʿHa¹-ar-ši^{ki} [ù ...]ʿx¹-[...]ʿx^{ki} Šušin^{ki}-ta i]r-ra *dub 4 z[i-ga-b]i Šu-En-líl-lá-ke*₄ ? *šu ti-a ... tùm-dam*, “the booty of Kimaš, Harši [and GN], which came [from] Susa, their four (former) expenditure tablets which were received by Šu-[Enlila?] ... are to be brought back” (Sigrist Princeton 60:11–17 – Šulgi 48/vii).

against the “land of the Amorites,” was part of the campaign against Kimaš and Hu`urti, conducted by the prince Šu-Enlila.<sup>13</sup> Accordingly, the Šimaškian territory involved must have represented one of the western-most Šimaškian lands. This is made certain by its association, on the one hand, with Kimaš and Hu`urti (both of which were situated in the western portion of the Kermanshah province¹⁴), and, on the other hand, with the “land of the Amorites,” which denotes Jebel Hamrin and, more generally, the entire piedmont zone, extending from the middle course of the Tigris to the region of Susiana.

Among the individuals who are identified as Šimaškians in Ur III sources, by far the most prominent is Yabrat¹⁵ (for a complete list of his attestations, see Appendix below). Yabrat is documented over a period of twenty-one years, from Šulgi 44 through Šu-Sin 8. Yabrat’s earliest mention comes from a Puzriš-Dagan tablet, in which he is identified, together with an Anšanite named Hundah(i)šer, as a supplier of GÚ.URU×GU

¹³ See Michalowski, JCS 31 (1979) 175 and n. 15; Steinkeller, JAOS 108, 201 n. 31. Here note the unique variant *mu ... Ki-maš^{ki} MAR.TU^{ki} ba-hul* (YOS 4 86:5), where MAR.TU^{ki} replaces Hu`urti in the formula of Šulgi’s forty-sixth year (*mu dŠul-gi ... Ki-maš<sup>ki</sup> Hu-ur<sub>5</sub>-ti<sup>ki</sup> ù ma-da-bi ud 1-a mu-hul*, “year Šulgi ... destroyed in one day Kimaš, Hu`urti and their [neighboring] lands”). Cf. S. J. Lieberman, JCS 22 (1968/69) 56 n. 28.

¹⁴ See Steinkeller, JAOS 108, 201 n. 31.

¹⁵ The name is written *lā-ab-ra-at* or *lā-a-ab-ra-at*. There are also single attestations of the writings *lā-a-ba-ra-at* (MVN 16 707:10; Nisaba 3 73 no. 105:11) and *Ab-ra-at* (Archi/Pomponio Dhehem 254:2); the latter writing probably also appears in Lafont/Yildiz Tello Istanbul 4259:5. In *lā-a-ab-ra-at* and *lā-a-ba-ra-at*, the sign *-a-* is a gloss, i.e., *lā^a-ab/ba-ra-at*; cf. Steinkeller in E. C. Stone/P. Zimansky, *The Anatomy of a Mesopotamian City: Survey and Soundings at Mashkan-shapir* (Winona Lake 2005), 40 n. 70. The later spellings *E-ba-ra-at* and *E-ba-ar-ti* (see below) reflect the historic shift of /ʾa/ to /e/.

In a number of instances (JCS 31 [1979] 35–36 BMC 2:13³; PDT 807 ii 9; Santag 6 262:2; Buccellati Amorites pls. XI–XII iii 8; JCS 7, 106–07 Kenrick iv 1; Viroilleaud TEL 46 i 2; ITT 5 9667), Yabrat’s name is provided with a geographical indicator K1. The reason for it is unclear. Possibly, the scribes confused it with the toponym Yabru (*lā-ab-ru^{ki}*), which is mentioned in connection with Huhnuri and Bitum-rabi^{um} in the year-formula of Amar-Suen’s seventh year. See also *Bil-li lú-kin-gi₄-a Zu-zu-wa-da-ar lú lā-a-ab-ru^{ki}* (MVN 15 216:13 – Šu-Suen 1/iii/9). Here note that the territorial possessions of Yabrat may have extended as far as Huhnuri – and therefore also Yabru? (see below, p. 223). If Yabrat resided near Yabru, the confusion between the two names would be easy to understand. Thus, the spelling *lā-ab-ra^{ki}* in Santag 6 262:2 would be intended, rather than defective (i.e., *lā-ab-ra<-at>^{ki}*). An alternative explanation could be that Yabrat’s domain lacked a specific toponymic designation. If true, this may have prompted the Babylonian scribes to lend it Yabrat’s name, meaning something like “Yabrat’s land” (as in “Prester John’s kingdom”).



Fig. 1: Šimaškian Lands and Neighboring Territories (Adapted after J. Curtis, *Ancient Persia* [Cambridge, MA 1990] 5)

animals (probably two-humped Bactrian camels).¹⁶ All the subsequent references to him invariably involve his envoys.¹⁷ Thus, with a possible

¹⁶ Hilgert Drehem 1 171:8–12 (Šulgi 44/x). The entries in question name 9 male and 5 female GÚ.URU×GU, delivered by Yabrat, a Šimaškian (LÚ.SU), followed by 2 male GÚ.URU×GU, supplied by Hundah(i)šer, the “man” of Anšan (*Hu-un-da-hi-še-er lú An-ša-an^{ki}*). For this text, and the zoological identification of the GÚ.URU×GU, see in detail my forthcoming article “Camels in Ur III Babylonia?” (to appear in a *Festschrift* for L. E. Stager, edited by D. Schloen, Chicago 2007). As I suggest there, the animals in question almost certainly represented a diplomatic gift for Šulgi.

¹⁷ One of those attestations (Lafont/Yildiz Tello Istanbul 4259:5–9 – [vi]) involves an

exception of the GÚ.URU×GU episode (as part of which he and Hundah(i)šer of Anšan, the other supplier of the GÚ.URU×GU, may actually have traveled to Babylonia), Yabrat probably never visited Babylonia in person.

As considered already by W. G. Lambert,¹⁸ and argued subsequently by M. W. Stolper¹⁹ and this author,²⁰ Yabrat can confidently be identified with the Šimaškian ruler Ebarat/Ebarti I, who is given the third spot in the ŠKL.

The same Ebarat is invoked in two successive year-formulae, which appear on the tablets from Susa dating some time after the year Ibbi-Suen 3 (which marks the end of Ibbi-Suen's effective rule over Susa).²¹ This extends the span of Yabrat/Ebarat attestations to at least twenty-six years (Šulgi 44 through Ibbi-Suen 5 or later).

The other Šimaškian rulers whose names appear both in Ur III documentation and in the ŠKL are Kirname, Ta'azite, Kindattu, and Idattu I. Of those, Kirname is first in the ŠKL. He (or, more precisely, his envoys) is documented twice, in the sources dating to Šu-Suen 3/iv/12 and Šu-Suen 6/ii/16 respectively.²² In both instances, Kirname's envoys accompany those of Yabrat. But Kirname's contacts with Babylonia may have begun considerably earlier, if, as it appears quite likely, he is the same person as a certain Gu-ri-na-me, whose slaves are named in MVN 12 125, dating to Šulgi 46/xii.²³

Passing now to Ta'azite, this ruler corresponds to either Tazitta I (no. 2) or Tazitta II (no. 4) of the ŠKL.²⁴ Like Kirname, Ta'azite is attested via his envoys, who are documented in the years Amar-Suen

envoy of Yabrat's son, who, quite likely, is Kindattu. For the filiation of Kindattu, see below p. 221 f. Unfortunately, the tablet in question does not use a year-formula, and so this point cannot further be verified.

¹⁸ Iraq 41 (1979) 38–44.

¹⁹ ZA 82, 49–50. See also E. Carter/M. W. Stolper, *Elam: Surveys of Political History and Archaeology* (Berkeley 1984) 20.

²⁰ JAOS 108, 200.

²¹ Steinkeller, *Sale Documents of the Ur III Period*. FAOS 17 (Stuttgart 1989) 274–75; K. De Graef, *Les noms d'année du roi Simaškéen Ebarat I*, *Akkadica* 125 (2004) 107–08; *eadem*, *Les archives d'Igibuni: Les documents Ur III du chantier B à Suse*. MDP 54 (Ghent 2005) 99, 105–06, 112–13.

²² *Ba-^cx¹-[...] ... Ba-a[b-du-ša] lú-kin-gi₄-a Ià-[ab]-ra-at LÚ.SU.A^{ki}-me ... Šu-tu-un-gu lú-kin-gi₄-a Ki-ir-na-mi LÚ.SU.A^{ki}* (Sigrist *Ontario* 149:1–5 – Šu-Suen 3/iv/12); *Ià-a-da-az lú-kin-gi₄-a Ki-ir-na-me ... Zu-úr-zu-ra lú-kin-gi₄-a Ià-ab-ra-at LÚ.SU^{ki}-me-éš* (Jacobsen *Copenhagen* 7:6–10 – Šu-Suen 6/ii/6).

²³ See Steinkeller, *JAOS* 108, 201–02.

²⁴ This identification was made first by Stolper, *ZA* 82, 50. See also Carter/Stolper, *Elam* 20.

8/i/18, Šu-Suen 2/xi/24, and Šu-Suen 2/xii/14; there is also one undatable occurrence.²⁵ In these four examples, his name is variously spelled *Da-a-zi<-te>*, *Da-a-zi-^fte¹*, *Da-a-zi!(G1)-te*, and *Da-at-zi-at-a*. Importantly, Ta'azite's envoys also accompanied those of Yabrat. In contrast to Kirname, however, Ta'azite is identified as an Anšanite, and not as a Šimaš-
kian. The significance of this fact will be discussed below.

As for Kindattu and Idattu I (nos. 6 and no. 7 in the ŠKL respectively), both of them are named in an Isin tablet dating to Išbi-Erra's "thirteenth" year.²⁶

Since Ebarat I (Yabrat), Kirname, and Tazitta (Ta'azite) are named concurrently in Ur III sources, the conclusion is unavoidable that they were contemporaries.²⁷ While this appears certain, it remains unclear, first, how these three rulers related to one another, and second, what their relationship was to the following kings of the ŠKL. Beginning with the second question, much of this uncertainty is now removed by a new inscription of Idattu I,²⁸ which identifies Idattu I as a son of Kindattu and grandson of Ebarat I:

- | | |
|--|---------------------|
| 1) ^d <i>I-da-du</i> | For Idattu, |
| 2) <i>dumu-dumu</i> ^d <i>E-ba-ra-at</i> | grandson of Ebarat, |
| 3) <i>dumu</i> ^d <i>Ki-in-da-du</i> | son of Kindattu, |

²⁵ *Da-bu-du-uk* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Iā-ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU ... *Gir-ri* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Da-a-zi<-te>* lú *An-ša-an*^{ki} (BIN 3 477:6-11 – Amar-Suen 8/i/18); [*B*] *a-ab-du-ša* lú-kin-gi₄-a [*Iā*] *ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU^{ki} ... *Ši-la-ti-ir* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Da-a-zi!(G1)-te* lú *An-ša-an*^{ki} (Babyloniaca 8 pl. VII Pupil 30:2-3 – Šu-Suen 2/xi/24); *B^aab-du-ša* lú-^fkin¹-gi₄-a *Iā-ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU^[ki] ... *Ši-la-ti-ir* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Da-a-zi-^fte¹* lú *An-ša-an*^{ki} (Astour AV 375 Nesbit D lines 2-4 – Šu-Suen 2/xii/14); NN lú-kin-gi₄-a *dumu* *Ab[?]-ra-at* ... NN lú-kin-gi₄-a *Da-at-zi-at-a-ka* (Lafont/Yildiz Tello Istanbul 4259:5-9 – [-/vi]).

²⁶ lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ki-in-da-du* lú-ús-sa-ni 5-bi ... lú-kin-gi₄-a *I-da-[du]* lú-ús-sa-ni [1-bi] lú-kin-gi₄-a L[Ú?SU?A?]^{ki}, "the envoy of Kindattu (and) his five followers ... the envoy of Ida[ttu] (and) his [one] follower; these are the messengers of 'Šimaški?'" (BIN 9 38:8-18 Išbi-Erra "13"). See Stolper, ZA 82, 47-48; Steinkeller, JAOS 108, 200 n. 27. The close association of Idattu with Kindattu, apparent in this example, is now explained by the fact of Idattu being Kindattu's son. See immediately below.

²⁷ For this conclusion, see already Stolper, ZA 72, 50.

²⁸ This inscription, which is written in classical Ur III script, is preserved in duplicate (both texts are identical) on two bronze vessels of unknown provenance. The former piece, shaped as a pot, was sold in 2001 at a Christie's auction in London. For a photograph and description, see Christie's Catalogue, Fine Antiquities, Wednesday 25, April 21, 2001 (London), 16-17 no. 23. Its present whereabouts are unknown to me. The other piece, a shallow bowl, is now part of the Martin Schøyen Collection in Oslo, Norway (MS 4476). A full edition of it will be offered by me in a forthcoming edition of historical inscriptions from the Schøyen Collection, edited by A. R. George.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 4) sipad ^d Utu | the shepherd of Utu, |
| 5) ki-ág ^d Inana | the beloved one of Inana, |
| 6) lugal <i>An-ša-an^{ki}</i> | king of Anšan, |
| 7) lugal <i>Si-ma-aš-ki</i> ù Elam-ma | king of Šimaški and Elam, |
| 8) <i>Ki-te-en-ra-ki-id-da-bi</i> | Kiten-rakittapi, |
| 9) suka1-mah Elam-ma ù <i>te-eb-bi-ir</i> | the chancellor of Elam and
the high judge, ²⁹ |
| 10) árad-da-a-ni | his servant, |
| 11) mu-na-dím | fashioned (this object) for
him. |

The resulting sequence Ebarat I > Kindattu > Idattu I roughly agrees with the ŠKL, where the same rulers are given ranks no. 3, no. 6, and no. 7 respectively. This fact shows, that, at least as far as its treatment of the line of Ebarat I is concerned, the ŠKL is a genuinely chronographic source.³⁰

The same, however, is not true of the ŠKL's treatment of the other early Šimašgian kings, since, as already noted, Ebarat I, Kirname and Tazitta (Ta'azite) were contemporaries. But what was the exact nature of the relationship between these three rulers? For this question, of key importance is the fact that, as observed earlier, the envoys of Kirname and Tazitta invariably accompanied those of Ebarat I. This, in my view, indicates the existence of close ties among this Šimašgian trio. But whether those ties were familial or political, we cannot determine at this time.

Be that as it may (and I will return to this problem below), the information that Kindattu was Ebarat's son is of enormous historical importance, since it establishes a direct connection between the conqueror of Ur and the most prominent Šimašgian of Ur III times. This calls for a closer look at Ebarat and his political career. While it is known that Ebarat maintained regular diplomatic contacts with the court of Ur from Šulgi 44 through Šu-Suen 8, we regrettably lack any information as to his whereabouts during all that time. In fact, all that we know for certain

²⁹ Here we find incontrovertible evidence that the suka1-mah of Elam was a deputy of the king of Anšan. The obvious inference from this is that the later (Old Babylonian) suka1-mahs of Susa were also dependent on the rulers of Anšan. However, this problem is too complicated to be treated here. For *tepper*, "high judge," see AHw., 1347b.

³⁰ This new evidence, plus various other data presented in this article, renders largely invalid the evaluation of the ŠKL by J.-J. Glassner, *Les dynasties d'Awan et de Šimaški*, NABU 1996/34. Note, in particular, the following conclusion: "Malgré les apparences, il est difficile de la considérer comme une source historiographique sérieuse."

about his territorial possessions is that sometime after the third regnal year of Ibbi-Suen he established himself at Susa. However, Ebarat's control of Susa appears to have been short-lived, since in the ninth year of Ibbi-Suen the Babylonians were able to launch a military campaign against Huhnuri and Anšan (which presupposes their possession of Susa at that time).³¹ This is further indicated by the fact that only two of Ebarat's year-formulae survive at Susa. All in all, these facts circumscribe the period of Ebarat's possible control over Susa to the years Ibbi-Suen 4–8.

Otherwise, we are in total darkness as to where Ebarat ruled prior to those events. Significantly, however, his name (and, for that matter, those of Kirname and Tazitta alike) is not mentioned in connection with any of the Šimaškian lands that were the object of Šu-Suen's campaign.³² In my view, this should be taken as an indication that Ebarat's domain was situated in the eastern-most section of Šimaškian territories, either on the border with or possibly even within the land of Anšan itself. Purely as an educated guess, I place that domain halfway between Tall-e Malyan (i.e., Anšan's capital) and Huhnuri, which, based on a recently published Ur III inscription from Iran,³³ is very likely identical (or at least geographically associated) with the site of Tappeh Bormi (3 km southwest of Ramhormoz).

³¹ mu ^dI-bí-^dSuen lugal Ūrim^{ki}-ma-ke₄ Hu-úh-nu-ri^{ki} sag-kul ma-da An-ša-an^{ki}-šè (var.: Elam^{ki}) á dugud(-bi) ba-ši-in-de₆ [x] SUM? sa bí-in-gar, “year Ibbi-Suen, king of Ur, brought massive (military) force to Huhnuri, the lock of Anšan/Elam (and) ...” (year Ibbi-Suen 9). It seems reasonable to think that, both for strategic and logistical reasons, the control of Susa and its region would have been indispensable to be able to launch a campaign against Huhnuri. Also, it seems unlikely that Huhnuri had been Ibbi-Suen's real target. That target, I suggest, was Anšan (or, more broadly, Ebarat's domain).

³² In fact, Ebarat appears to have sided with Šu-Suen in that conflict. See below p. 227. To my knowledge, the only Šimaškian opponent of Šu-Suen that is mentioned both in Šu-Suen's historical inscriptions and in contemporary administrative records is DUN-gá-at of Yabulmat (Frayne, RIME 3/2, 312 Ex. 1 Caption 12). Because of his unique name, I assume that he is the same person as DUN-gá-a-at lú Zi-da-ah-ri^{ki} (Nesbit Dreher XVII:15 – Amar-Suen 7/viii/2; PDT 1170:12 – Amar-Suen 7/viii/7; HUCA 29 [1958] 77 no. 6:3 – Amar-Suen 7/viii/16; JCS 57 [2005] 28 no. 5:12 – Amar-Suen 8/ix/12; Hilgert Dreher 2 555:3 – Amar-Suen 8/ix/13; BIN 3 173:7 – Amar-Suen 8/ix/14). Cf. D. O. Edzard, AfO 19 (1959/60) 26. Here note that, in Šu-Suen 1, the men of Zidahri appeared together with some Šimaškians at Nippur to take an oath of allegiance (to Šu-Suen) in Ninurta's temple: nam-érem é ^dNin-urta mu LÚ.SU ù lú Zi-da-ah-ri^{ki}-ke₄-ne-šè, “(animals for) the oath of allegiance in the temple of Ninurta, on behalf of the Šimaškians and the men of Zidahri” (JCS 14 [1960] 111 no. 14:16–17 – Šu-Suen 1/ix).

³³ B. M. Nasrabadi, Eine Inschrift des Amar-Suena aus Tappeh Bormi (Iran), ZA 95 (2005) 161–71.

This hypothesis is strongly supported by the fact that Anšan was the focal point of the kingdom of Kindattu, Ebarat's son and apparent successor. Thus, (1) Kindattu is associated with Anšan in later historical sources³⁴; (2) it was to Anšan that Ibbi-Suen was carried after the sack of Ur³⁵; (3) it was from Anšan that the statue of Nanna of Ur, presumably removed from there by Kindattu, was returned to Ur by Šuilišu, Išbi-Erra's successor at Isin³⁶; and (4) it was from Anšan that diplomatic letters are known to have been sent to Išbi-Erra not long before Kindattu's descent on Babylonia.³⁷ Even more importantly, the *primary* royal title of Kindattu³⁸ (and later of his son Idaddu, see the inscription above), was the “king of Anšan.”

That Ebarat's domain bordered on (or perhaps even was part of) the land of Anšan is further indicated by the fact that the envoys³⁹ of the “men” of Anšan – the latter being Hundah(i)šer, Binzi,⁴⁰ and Tazitta

³⁴ *Ki-in-da-tulú* Elam^{ki}-ma-ra inim-bi ba-an-na-de₆ *An-ša₄-an^{ki} Šimaški*(LÚ.SU)^{ki} šeg₁₁ ba-ab-gi₄ kur im-ma-an-te ‘ugnim¹-ma-ni pu-úh-ru-um-bi inim mu-na-ni-ib-bé, “the news was carried to Kindattu, the man of Elam; the Anšanites and Šimaškians gave a battle cry; he (i.e., Kindattu) approached the mountains (with them); he addresses his assembled army” (Išbi-Erra B = Išbi-Erra and Kindattu Segment E 7–9).

³⁵ *dI-bi-^dSuen* kur Elam^{ki}-ma-šè gišbúr-ra túm-mu-dè iš(i) *Za-bu*(^{ki}) gaba a-ab-ba-ka-ta (var.: gaba hur-sag-gá-ta) zag *An-ša₄-an^{ki}-šè*, “that Ibbi-Suen will be taken to the land Elam in fetters from the sand dunes of Zabu on the coast of the Sea (var.: on the border of the mountain ranges) to the border of Anšan” (Lamentation over Sumer and Ur 35–36); BALA GILIM.MA *ša I-bi-^dSuen* LUGAL *Úrim^{ki} ka-mu-us-su ana An-ša₄-an^{ki} GIN-ku i-bak-ku-ú*, “the reign of destruction of Ibbi-Suen, king of Ur, who, in tears, went as captive to Anšan” (ACh Ištar LXVII rev. ii 11–12).

³⁶ ud *dNanna An-ša-an^{ki}-ta Úrim^{ki}-šè* mu-un-túm-ma-a, “when he brought (back) (the statue of) Nanna from Anšan to Ur” (Frayne, RIME 4, 14–15 Šu-ilišu 1:8–11).

³⁷ 2 *kušdùg-gan* ‘ti¹-bala kišib-ra ù-na-a-dug₄ *An-ša-an^{ki}-ta* gá-gá-dè, “2 leather courier's pouches to keep the sealed letters from Anšan” (BIN 9 302:1–3 – Išbi-Erra “8”).

³⁸ See *I-ma-zu / dumu Ki-in-da-du / lugal An-ša-an-na^{ki}* (MDP 43/2, pl. 34 no. 1679 [drawing], pl. 157 no. 1679 [photograph], an impression of a cylinder seal on an unpublished tablet, Teheran Museum no. 2514).

³⁹ In Ur III times, foreign envoys or emissaries were invariably designated by the term *lú-kin-gi₄-a*. See T. M. Sharlach, *Diplomacy and the Rituals of Politics at the Ur III Court*, JCS 57 (2005) 18–19.

⁴⁰ *Zu-bu-uš lú-kin-gi₄-a Iá-ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU^{ki} ... *Hu-un-na-zi lú-kin-gi₄-a BÍ-in-zi lú An-ša-an^{ki}* (A 5477:8’–9’ – unpublished; ca. Amar-Suen 2/vi/23); *La-ba-na-am-zi lú Iá-a[b]-ra-at* ¹ki¹ ... *Ad-da-[bu?]-hu-dah lú BÍ-in-zi* [(lú) *An-ša-an^{ki}*] (PDT 807 ii 9–10 – ca. Amar-Suen 2/ix/23). The envoy Hunnazi (A 5477) may eventually have become a ruler of Anšan himself. See Buccellati *Amorites* pls. XI–XII 22 iii 13–14 (ŠS 6/?/20),

(Ta'azite) – routinely accompanied those of Ebarat. As a matter of fact, we lack any documented cases of *an Anšanite envoy ever appearing independently of an envoy of Yabrat*. Moreover, these Anšhanites are always listed *following* Ebarat's envoys, which almost certainly implies their lesser rank and status.

Indeed, the same “inferiority” of Anšhanites vis-à-vis Ebarat is discernable in the Puzriš-Dagan tablet recording the delivery of the GÚ.URU×GU animals (see above, p. 218). There, Ebarat, bearing thirteen GÚ.URU×GU, is given precedence over Hundah(i)šer of Anšan, delivering only two GÚ.URU×GU.

And last but not least is the fact that Ebarat's apparent ally Tazitta, who figures as a *Šimaškian* in the ŠKL, is identified as an *Anšanite* in Ur III sources. This datum, too, points to Ebarat's close connection with Anšan and its rulers.

In consideration of all these data, the following historical scenario may be proposed. During the years Šulgi 44 – Šu-Suen 8, Ebarat ruled over a kingdom embracing either the western borderlands of Anšan or the western portion of Anšan itself. Whichever was the case, in his relationship with Anšan proper Ebarat held an upper hand, probably controlling it through his allies or vassals, possibly his relatives (a cadet line of Ebarat's family?). Among those were Hundah(i)šer, Binzi, and Tazitta.

Ebarat's “special relationship” with Anšan must be seen within the context of the Ur III state's eastern policy, which was largely created by Šulgi. As Babylonia began to expand territorially in the first half of Šulgi's reign, Šulgi strived to establish political alliances with Anšan and Marhaši (Anšan's eastern neighbor⁴¹) as a way of protecting Babylonia's eastern flank, which remained in constant unrest, owing mainly to the Šimaškian resistance and the Amorite intrusions into that region. This strategic manœuvre began in Šulgi's eighteenth year, when a Sumerian princess was given in marriage to the ruler of Marhaši.⁴² A si-

which names *Hu-še-ri-dah* lú *Hu-na-z[i]* and 5 lú-ús-sa-ni (following Ebarat's envoy Nimzi).

⁴¹ For the location of Marhaši, see Steinkeller, *The Question of Marhaši: A Contribution to the Historical Geography of Iran in the Third Millennium B.C.*, ZA 72 (1982) 237–65; *idem*, *New Light on Marhaši and its Contacts with Makkan and Babylonia*, *Journal of Magan Studies* 1 (2006) (in press); D. T. Potts, *Exit Aratta: Southeastern Iran and the Land of Marhashi*, *Nāme-ye Irān-e Bāstān* 4 (2004) 41–51.

⁴² mu *Li-wir*_x(GİR×DI)-*mi-da-šu* dumu-munus lugal nam-nin *Mar-ha-ši*^{ki} ba-īl, “year Liwwir-miṭṭašu, the king's daughter, was elevated to the queenship of Marhaši” (year Šulgi 18).

milar dynastic union with Anšan followed twelve years later (year Šulgi 30).⁴³

The alliance with Marhaši proved to be highly successful, since it endured all the way into the reign of Ibbi-Suen.⁴⁴ Anšan, however, was a different matter altogether. The familial ties with the House of Ur had clearly not been sufficient to insure Anšan's loyalty, since already three years later (year Šulgi 33) Šulgi was forced to intervene in Anšan militarily; another, more extensive campaign against Anšan appears to have taken place during the following year.⁴⁵

⁴³ mu dumu-munus lugal énsi *An-ša-an/-na^{ki}-ke₄* ba-an-tuku, "year the king's daughter was married by the governor of Anšan" (year Šulgi 30); mu dumu lugal nin *An-ša-an-na-še* ba-gin (UET 3 300:8). The énsi in question possibly was Šelebum, who is mentioned in an undated text from Girsu/Lagaš: *I-din^dIM* rá-gaba <Še> *le-bu-um* énsi *An-ša-an^{ki}* (RTC 328:4–7). This text must date roughly to Šulgi 33, since it also refers to an énsi of AdamDUN named Ur-gigir (lú Ur-^{giš}gigir énsi *A-dam-DUN^{ki}* *An-ša-an^{ki}-ta* gin-na, lines 10–11), who is otherwise documented in a tablet from Šulgi 33 (see below n. 45). Cf. *Ša-la-bu-um* énsi *An-ša-an^{ki}*, who appears in an unpublished tablet, cited by H. de Genouillac, *Tablettes* 12 MIO 2372.

⁴⁴ As demonstrated by the continuous presence of Marhašean envoys at the court of Ur – from Šulgi 46 through Ibbi-Suen 1 (see P. Michalowski, ZA 95, 73–74; T. M. Sharlach, JCS 57, 24–25), the regular movements of officials between Babylonia and Marhaši, the deployment of Marhašean troops in Babylonia, and the presentation to Ibbi-Suen of a Meluhhan leopard by an unidentified ruler of Marhaši (see Steinkeller, ZA 72, 253 and n. 60; D. T. Potts, *Total Prestation in Marhashi-Ur Relations*, *Iranica Antiqua* 37 [2002] 343–57).

⁴⁵ That Šulgi campaigned against Anšan in his thirty-third regnal year is shown by a Puzriš-Dagan tablet dating to Šulgi 33/xi, which records sheep delivered as part of the booty of Anšan by an énsi of AdamDUN: 44 udu-hi-a ba-úš nam-ra-ak *An-ša-an^{ki}* ki Ur-^{giš}gigir énsi *A-dam-DUN^{ki}-ta* (von Soden AV 80 no. 6:1–3). Although it is possible that this is the event that gave name to Šulgi's following, i.e., thirty-fourth year (mu *An-ša-an^{ki}* ba-hul; with a variant ud *An-sa-an^{ki}* Šul-gi mu-hul [NRVN 7:10]), a more likely solution is that the formula in question refers to a separate campaign. I base this conclusion on the existence of a unique formula mu *An-ša-an^{ki}* a-ra 2-kam ba-hul, "year Anšan was destroyed for the second time" (YOS 4 286:7), which is probably a variant of mu *An-ša-an^{ki}* ba-hul. Such an assumption finds further support in the Girsu/Lagaš tablets from Šulgi 34 and 35, which refer to amphibious movements of troops between Anšan and Makkan (ugnim *An-ša-an^{ki}-ta* bala-a, "troops transferred from Anšan," ugnim/éren Má-gan^{ki}-še bala-a, "troops transferred to Makkan"; MVN 10 149 [Šulgi 34/v–viii], TLB 3 145 [Šulgi 34/v–35/ii], TLB 3 146 [Š 34/ix–35/ii]; edited and discussed by R. K. Englund, *Ur III-Fischerei* 107–25). Moreover, an Umma tablet dating to Šulgi 35 records jewels and precious objects designated as gil-sa kúr Elam, "treasure of the land of Elam" (TCL 5 6044 vi 6). Assuming that these items were fruits of the Anšan campaign (so G. Pettinato, *Oriens Antiquus* 21 [1982] 49–72), chances are that the sack of Anšan took place in the immediately preceding year (i.e., Šulgi 34) rather than two years ear-

It was those upheavals, apparently, that were directly responsible for Ebarat's rise to power. Šulgi's campaigns must have weakened Anšan considerably – both politically and economically,⁴⁶ very likely creating a power vacuum. I assume that it was at that juncture that Ebarat was able to assume an upper hand vis-à-vis Anšan, perhaps even turning it into a vassal dependency. Whether he achieved that goal on his own, or with Šulgi's support – as part of the latter's grand geopolitical design – remains unclear.

Whichever the case may have been, all the indications are that throughout the reigns of Šulgi, Amar-Suen, and Šu-Suen, Ebarat remained loyal to the House of Ur. He may even have cooperated militarily with Babylonia. One thinks here of two specific occasions for such a co-operation, in fact. Assuming that his territorial possessions reached to the west as far as Huhnuri (probably Tappeh Bormi near Ramhormoz, see above p. 223), Amar-Suen's campaign against Huhnuri in the latter's seventh regnal year very likely involved Ebarat's support and perhaps even his active military participation.

The other occasion may have been the Šimaškian revolt against Ur in the second half of Šu-Suen's reign. Since Ebarat's (and likewise Kirname's) envoys continued to travel to Babylonia during those years, he clearly took no part in it; if he participated in that conflict at all, it was certainly on Šu-Suen's side.⁴⁷

lier. Accordingly, I conclude that there were two successive operations against Anšan: a preliminary one in Šulgi 33, and the main in Šulgi 34.

⁴⁶ How extensive and thorough Šulgi's looting of Anšan must have been is shown by the earlier-cited text TCL 5 6044 (see the preceding note). The hundreds of precious objects listed there clearly represented only Umma's share of the loot. Thus, the size of the entire Anšan treasure, most of which probably ended up at Ur and Nippur, must have been truly colossal.

⁴⁷ Here it is significant that, precisely at the time of the Šimaškian war, Šu-Suen was sent from Anšan a diplomatic gift consisting of a "great goat" (apparently some exotic caprid): *ud ma-da Za-a[b]-ša-li^{ki1} ù ma-d[a m]a-da Šimaški(LÚ.SU)^{ki}-ka mu-hul-a máš gal gún^{un} An-ša-an-na^{ki} mu-un-de₆-na dam-ši-lum-bi mu-na-an-dím*, "when he destroyed the land of Zabšali and the (other) lands of Šimaški, he fashioned (for deity NN) a likeness of the 'great goat' that was brought to him (at that time) as tribute of Anšan" (Frayne RIME 3/2, 313 Šu-Sin 6 lines 5'–13'). The timing of this gift certainly was not accidental; note that the text emphasizes the historical circumstances of the gift, which is quite unique. Thus, the gift must have symbolized Anšan's loyalty to Šu-Suen at the time when he faced a grave political and military challenge. Its symbolic message is quite obvious: an Anšanite goat (= Anšan) remains in the fold of the "shepherd" of Sumer and Akkad. Should we assume that it was Ebarat who was behind this offering?

Another indication of good relations between Babylonia and Anšan during Šu-Suen's

This situation changed dramatically in the beginning of Ibbi-Suen's reign, when Ebarat, apparently sensing the coming end of Ur, occupied Susa and established himself there as an independent ruler (sometime after Ibbi-Suen 3 and before Ibbi-Suen 9).⁴⁸ By so doing, he turned from one of the staunchest allies of Babylonia into the most dangerous enemy she was yet to face. In response to this threat, and as a sign of changing times, Ibbi-Suen now approached his former arch-enemy Zabšali (in year Ibbi-Suen 5),⁴⁹ apparently hoping to create with Zabšali and other Šimaškian lands an alliance against Ebarat, and so to circumscribe his territorial expansion and growing political power.

It appears that these efforts were temporarily successful, since Ebarat's possession of Susa was very brief (two years or so). He may have been dislodged therefrom by Ibbi-Suen's military campaign in the year Ibbi-Sin 9, whose main target undoubtedly was Anšan (which, by that time, may have completely passed under Ebarat's rule), and therefore against Ebarat himself as well. If Ebarat was no longer alive by that time, the campaign in question was directed against his son Kindattu. The following events are well-known: Kindattu consolidates his power over Anšan and all the Šimaškian territories; expands his rule to Susa and the Susiana; sacks Ur and brings hapless Ibbi-Suen as a prisoner to Anšan.

Certainly, the correctness of this reconstruction can be proved (or disproved) only by the appearance of new data. What is not in doubt, however, is the significance of the ŠKL. As demonstrated by Idaddu's inscription (see above pp. 221–222), the ŠKL is built around a genuine dynastic tradition, which centers on the line of Ebarat I: Ebarat I (no. 3), Kindattu (no. 6), and Idattu I (no. 7). This line continues with Tan-Ru-

reign are the references to a Sumerian princess traveling to Anšan, probably to be given in marriage to its ruler: *níg-gún-na An-za(-gàr)-ra-šè íl-gá mu dumu-munus lugal An-ša-an-šè gin-na-šè*, “(seven slave women) carrying supplies to Anzagar (of Umma) as the king's daughter went to Anšan” (Yildiz/Gomi Umma 2202:4–5 – Šu-Suen 5/–; Umma); *dumu-munus lugal An-ša-an^{ki}-šè du-ni*, “(food provisions for) the king's daughter going to Anšan” (ZA 19 [1905/06] 385 lines 9'–11' – Šu-Suen [5?]/i; Girsu/Lagaš). [N. B. there appears to have been yet another Sumerian princess that was married off to Anšan. See MVN 5 145:1–5 = Watson Birmingham 2 166 (Umma), dating to Šulgi 44: 5 *silá i-¹giš¹ l(bán) ga-har dumu-munus lugal An-ša-an^{ki}-šè gin-na šu ba-ti*, “the king's daughter received 5 liters of sesame oil (and) 10 liters of cheese (when) she went to Anšan.” Cf. below n. 51.]

⁴⁸ See above, p. 223.

⁴⁹ mu *Tu-ki-in-PA-mi-ig-ri-ša* dumu-munus lugal énsi *Za-ab-ša-li^{ki}* ba-an-tuku, “year Tukin-ḫaṭṭi-migriša, the king's daughter, was married by the ensi of Zabšali” (year Ibbi-Suen 5).

hurater (no. 8), who is otherwise known to have been the son of Idattu I.⁵⁰ Apart from having continued for at least four generations, that tradition was also associated with a *specific territorial state* – Ebarat’s original kingdom – which gradually swallowed up Anšan and other Šimaškian territories, and eventually came to embrace Susa and the Susiana as well.⁵¹

The central position of Ebarat’s family in the ŠKL further suggests that Kirname and Tazitta – as well as the mysterious *Lu-^rx-x-ak?¹-lu-uh-*

⁵⁰ See *I-da-du* ki-ág ^d*Inšušinak* lugal *Si-ma-aš-ki* ù Elam-ma *Tan-^dRu-hu-ra-t*[*i-ir*] dumu ki-[ág-gá-ni énsi Šušin^{ki}] (MDP 14, pl. III, 4 lines 1–7 = F. Malbran-Labat, *Les inscriptions royales de Suse. Briques de l’époque paléo-élamite à l’Empire néo-élamite* [Paris 1995] 29 no. 9); [*Tan-^dRu-hu-[ra-ti-ir]* / énsi Šušin^{ki} / [ki-ág] ^d[*Inšušinak*] / [du]mu *I-da-d*[u] (MDP 43/2, pl. 34 no. 1675 [drawing], pl. 156 no. 1675 [photograph], an impression of a cylinder seal on an unpublished tablet, Sb 2298). This filiation is also recorded in the inscriptions of the twelfth-century ruler Šilhak-Inšušinak (König EKI nos. 48 § 2, 48a § 3, 48b § 3).

The ŠKL then continues with Ebarat II (no. 9) and Idattu II (no. 10). While the familial relation of Ebarat II to the other Šimaškians is unclear, Idattu II is known to have been the son of Tan-Ruhurater. See Malbran-Labat, *Inscriptions* 26–28 nos. 6–7; 29 no. 8; MDP 43/3, pl. 33 no. 1677 (drawing), pl. 156 no. 1677 (photograph). It would seem, therefore, that Ebarat II was either a younger brother of Tan-Ruhurater or Tan-Ruhurater’s eldest son.

⁵¹ This new appreciation of Ebarat I and his political importance forces us seriously to consider that the royal seal published by W. G. Lambert, *Iraq* 41 (1979) 15–17 no. 42 and pl. V no. 42 (photograph) (for a superior photograph, see RA 83 [1989] 26 fig. A), concerns this ruler, rather than Ebarat II. This seal, which probably depicts Ebarat handing flowers to his wife, bears the following inscription: ^d[*E?-ba?-r*]-*a-at* lugal / ^rx¹-[...] / dam ki!-^rág¹-[gá-ni], “Ebarat, the king; ‘Female Name’, [(is) his] bel[oved] wife” (Lambert’s reading *na-^rram¹-[ta-šu]*, while probable, seems less likely; n. b. the restoration *Si-[maš-gi^{ki}]* in the second line of the inscription, proposed by M.-J. Steve, RA 83 [1989] 15, with a translation “(A) Ebarat, roi de Simaški, son épouse chérie,” is impossible, since (1) a dedicatory inscription of this type is unknown among third millennium seal inscriptions, (2) the GN would be expected to be written in the same line as lugal, and (3) the first sign of the second line definitely does not look like *si*). Accordingly, this seal must have belonged to Ebarat’s wife. Though the use of a divine semantic indicator before Ebarat’s name is seemingly a problem, the spelling ^d*Ia-a-ba-ra-at* in one of the Susa tablets with Ebarat I’s year formulae (MDP 23 292) shows that Ebarat I achieved deification already during his lifetime.

Unfortunately, the name of Ebarat’s wife is not preserved. Still, given Ebarat’s close and long-lasting ties with the House of Ur, a possibility that she was a Sumerian princess might be considered. As we have seen earlier (see above n. 47), at least two times during Ebarat’s tenure Sumerian princesses traveled to Anšan, in the years Šulgi 44 and Šu-Suen 5, respectively. Tantalizingly, it was in Šulgi 44 that Ebarat supplied his GÚ.URU×GU – and possibly even traveled to Babylonia at that time. Is it possible, then, that he (or alternatively his Anšanite companion Hundah(i)šer) had also collected a bride on that occasion?

ha-an (no. 5), who cannot so far be positively identified with any of the Šimaškians known from Ur III sources⁵² – were all Ebarat's kinsmen, who co-ruled with him over his domain as his viceroys or deputies. In the case of Tazitta, we know that he presided, apparently as Ebarat's surrogate, over Anšan. The case of Kirname is more difficult. Because of his prominent placement in the ŠKL, Kirname must have been a personage nearly on par with Ebarat. The fact that his dates match those of Ebarat, and that he is clearly given less importance than Ebarat in Ur III documentation, excludes the possibility of him being Ebarat's father. Should we assume, therefore, that he was Ebarat's brother, who perhaps ranked only second to Ebarat in the administration of the latter's kingdom? This question takes us back to the historical reconstruction of the period, which, as pointed out earlier, cannot as yet be fully drawn.

Appendix: Attestations of Yabrat/Ebarat in Ur III Documentation

Note: The documentation does not include Ebarat's date-formulae in Susa texts. Unless stated otherwise the origin of sources is Puzriš-Dagan.

Šulgi 44/x/13: *Ià-ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU delivers 13 GŪ.URU×GU ... *Hu-un-da-hi-še-er* lú *An-ša-an*^{ki} delivers 2 GŪ.URU×GU (Hilgert Drehem 1 171:8–12).

Šulgi 46/ix: NN lú *Ià-ab-ra-at*^{ki} (JCS 31 [1979] 35–36 BMC 2:13' – cited courtesy of M. Molina, Base de Datos de Textos Sumerios).

[Amar-Suen 2/vi/23]: *Zu-bu-uš* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU^{ki} ... *Hu-un-na-zi* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Bí-in-zi* lú *An-ša-an*^{ki} (A 5477:8'–9' – unpublished). The date is reconstructed based on parallels with Fish Behrens 254 (Amar-Suen 2/vi/3) and Legrain TRU 305 (Amar-Suen 2/vi/4).

[ca. Amar-Suen 2/ix/23]: *La-ba-na-am-zi* lú *Ià-a[b]-ra-at*^{ki} ... *Ad-da-[bu?-ni?]-hu-dah* lú *Bí-in-zi* [(lú) *An-ša-an*^{ki}] (PDT 807 ii 9–10). The date is reconstructed based on Langdon Archives of Drehem 67 (Amar-Suen 2/ix/23).

Amar-Suen 3/i/11+[x]: *Z[u-bu]-uš* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-a-ab-^rra-at* LÚ.[SU(A^{ki})] (TCL 2 5559:9).

Amar-Suen 5/xii/22: *Zu-bu-uš* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU.A^{ki} (AUCT 2 318:8–9).

Amar-Suen 6/ii/4: *Zu-bu-uš* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU^{ki} (NBC 9998:4, unpublished, courtesy of M. Sigrist).

Amar-Suen 6/ii/16: *Zu-bu-uš* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU^{ki} (Sigrist Ontario 48:1).

Amar-Suen 6/ii/24: *Zu-bu-uš* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU^{ki} (Fish Behrens 466:5–6 + T. Gomi, MVN 12, 114, collations).

[ca. AS 6/ii]: *[Z]u-bu-uš* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU (MVN 11 144:2; cited courtesy of M. Molina, Base de Datos de Textos Sumerios). The date is reconstructed based on Sigrist Ontario 48.

Amar-Suen 7/v/21: *Ga-da-ad-du* ... *Zu-bu-uš* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-a-ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU.A^{ki}-me (Ebla 1975–1985, 267 Trout Tablet lines 17–19).

⁵² See Steinkeller, JAOS 108, 200 n. 27, for a highly tentative identification.

- Amar-Suen 7/vi/12: *Du-li-a* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU^{ki} (Archi/Pomponio Drehem 254:2).
- Amar-Suen 7/vi/13: *Du-li-a* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU^{ki} (RA 8 [1911] 191 no. 12:1–2).
- Amar-Suen 8/i/18: *Da-bu-du-uk* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU ... *Gir-ri* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Da-a-zi* <-te> lú *An-ša-an*^{ki} (BIN 3 477:6–11).
- Amar-Suen 8/[i/18]: *Da-bu-d*[u-uk 1]ú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-a*[b]-ra-at LÚ.SU^{ki} (MVN 13 636:9'–10'). The date is reconstructed based on BIN 3 477 (see the preceding entry).
- Amar-Suen 8/xii: 2 har kug-babbar 8 gín <-ta> *Pù-šu-ud* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU.A^{ki} ud LÚ.SU.A^{ki} <-ta> i-im-gin-na-a in-be₄ ... šag₄ Nibru^{ki}, “Pušud, the envoy of Yabrat, the Šimaškian, received as his allotment 2 silver rings (weighing) 8 shekels <each>, when he came <from> Šimaški ... in Nippur” (Jean Šumer et Akkad LXV:57 lines 1–8). Note that, ten years earlier, the same Pušud acted as an envoy of the Šimaškian Barbanazu: animals é-^rmu^rhaldim^r [m]u *Pù-šu-du* ^rlú-kin-gi₄-a^r *Ba-ar-ba*^r-na-zu LÚ.SU^{ki} (BIN 3 502:23–25 – Šulgi 46/v/27). For Barbanazu (also known as Barbarazi), see Steinkeller, Camels in Ur III Babylonia? (as note 16).
- Amar-Suen 9/ii/26: *Ba-ab-du-ša* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU (Jones-Snyder SET 66:28–29).
- Šu-Suen 2/xi/24: [B]*a-ab-du-ša* lú-kin-gi₄-a [Ià]*-ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU^{ki} ... *Ši-la-ti-ir* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Da-a-zi*!(G₁)-te lú *An-ša-an*^{ki} (Babyloniaca 8 pl. VII Pupil 30:2–3).
- Šu-Suen 2/xii/14: ^rB^r*a-ab-du-ša* lú-^rkin^r-gi₄-a *Ià-ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU^[ki] ... *Ši-la-ti-ir* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Da-a-zi*!^rte^r lú *An-ša-an*^{ki} (Astour AV, 375 Nesbit D lines 2–4).
- Šu-Suen 3/iv/12: *Ba*-^rx^r!-[...] ... *Ba-a*[b-du-ša] lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià*-[ab]-ra-at LÚ.SU.A^{ki}-me ... *Šu-tu-un-gu* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ki-ir-na-mi* LÚ.SU.A^{ki} (Sigrist Ontario 149:1–5).
- Šu-Suen 3/vii/10: *Ni-im-zi* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU.[A^{ki}] (Sigrist Rochester 86:29–30).
- Šu-Suen 3/–: <Ba>*ab-du-ša* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-ab-ra* <-at>^{ki} é-gal-ta gin-na gír *Da-a-a* lú-kin-gi₄-a lugal (Santag 6 262:2–3 – Umma; cited courtesy of P. Michalowski). <Šu-Suen 3>: <Ba>*ab-du-ša* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-ab-ra*-(^{at}ki) é <-gal>-ta gin-na-aš gír *Da-a-a* [gištu]kul ra-gaba? (JCS 57 [2005] 28–29 no. 8:9–12 – Umma). The date and the text are restored after Santag 6 262 (see the preceding entry).
- Šu-Suen 4/vi: NNs lú-kin-gi₄-a <<ad>> *Ià-ab-ra-at-me-éš* <<ME>> (Lafont/Yildiz Tello Istanbul 2756:8–9 – Girsu/Lagaš).
- Šu-Suen 5/i: *Ni-im-zi* (erased line) lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-ab-ra-at*^{ki} LÚ.SU^{ki}-me (Sigrist Princeton 22 iv 4'–8' [forthcoming]; cited courtesy of M. Molina).
- Šu-Suen 5/iii: *Zú-úr-zú-úr* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-ab-ra-at* (T. Ozaki and M. Sigrist, Ur III Administrative Tablets from the British Museum 1 [Madrid 2006] no. 853:13–14 – Umma).
- Šu-Suen 5/vi: NN lú *Ià-ab-ra-at* ... NN lú *An-ša-na*^{ki} (Istanbul 2889:4–8 – Umma; cited courtesy of M. Molina, Base de Datos de Textos Sumerios).
- Šu-Suen 6/ii/6: *Ià-a-da-az* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ki-ir-na-me* ... *Zu-úr-zu-ra* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU^{ki}-me-éš (Jacobsen Copenhagen 7:6–10).
- Šu-Suen 6/iii: *Zú-úr-zú-úr* lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-a-ba-ra-at* (MVN 16 707:9–11 – Umma).
- Šu-Suen 6/v: NN lú-kin-gi₄-a *Ià-a-ba-ra-at* (Milone and Spada UMTBM 2 = Nisaba 3, 73 no. 105:11 – Umma; cited courtesy of M. Molina).
- Šu-Suen 6/?/20: *Ni-im-zi* lú *Ià-ab-ra-at*^{ki} 7 lú-ús-sa-ni, “his followers” (Buccellati Amorites pls. XI–XII 22 iii 8–9 – Girsu/Lagaš?).
- <Šu-Suen 6/?/20>: [N]i-im-zi lú *Ià*-[ab]-ra-^rat^r^{ki} [7 1]ú-ús-sa-ni (JCS 7 [1953] 106–07 Kenrick 72 iv 1–2 – Girsu/Lagaš?).

Šu-Suen 8/i-xii: Elam *Ià-ab-ra-at^{ki}-me* (Virolleaud TEL 46 i 2 – Girsu/Lagaš?).

Šu-Suen 8/xii: Elamites of *Ià-ab-ra-at^{ki}* (ITT 5 9667, transliteration only – Girsu/Lagaš).

Year unknown: *Ba-ab-du-ša lú-kin-gi₄-a Ià-ab-ra-at* LÚ.SU (Gelb, *Studi Della Vida* 1, 384 n. 1 Schrijver no. 42 rev. 1).

Year unknown, month vi: NN *lú-kin-gi₄-a dumu 'Ab?¹-ra-at ... NN lú-kin-gi₄-a Da-at-zi-at-a-ka* (Lafont/Yildiz Tello Istanbul 4259:5–9 – Girsu/Lagaš).